

**The Flinders Petrie papyri with transcriptions, commentaries & index. By Rev. John P. Mahaffy ...**

Mahaffy, J. P. (John Pentland), 1839-1919.

Dublin, Hodges, Figgis, & co., [etc., etc.] 1891.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015009011126>

# HathiTrust



[www.hathitrust.org](http://www.hathitrust.org)

**Public Domain in the United States,  
Google-digitized**

[http://www.hathitrust.org/access\\_use#pd-us-google](http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-us-google)

We have determined this work to be in the public domain in the United States of America. It may not be in the public domain in other countries. Copies are provided as a preservation service. Particularly outside of the United States, persons receiving copies should make appropriate efforts to determine the copyright status of the work in their country and use the work accordingly. It is possible that current copyright holders, heirs or the estate of the authors of individual portions of the work, such as illustrations or photographs, assert copyrights over these portions. Depending on the nature of subsequent use that is made, additional rights may need to be obtained independently of anything we can address. The digital images and OCR of this work were produced by Google, Inc. (indicated by a watermark on each page in the PageTurner). Google requests that the images and OCR not be re-hosted, redistributed or used commercially. The images are provided for educational, scholarly, non-commercial purposes.









*JULY, 1891.]*

## Royal Irish Academy.

### "CUNNINGHAM MEMOIRS."—No. VIII.

ON THE

## FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI.

WITH

TRANSCRIPTIONS, COMMENTARIES, AND INDEX.

By the REV. JOHN P. MAHAFFY, D.D., F.T.C.D.

With Thirty Autotypes.



DUBLIN:

PUBLISHED AT THE ACADEMY HOUSE, 19, DAWSON-STREET.

SOLD ALSO BY

HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., GRAFTON-STREET.

AND BY WILLIAMS & NORGATE,

LONDON:

14, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden.

EDINBURGH:

20, South Frederick-street.

1891.

PRICE TWO GUINEAS.



**THE**  
**FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI**  
**WITH**  
**TRANSCRIPTIONS AND COMMENTARIES.**



THE  
**FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI**  
WITH  
TRANSCRIPTIONS, COMMENTARIES  
AND  
**I N D E X.**

BY  
**REV. JOHN P. MAHAFFY, D.D., F.T.C.D.**

AUTOTYPES I. to XXX.



DUBLIN:

PUBLISHED AT THE ACADEMY HOUSE, 19, DAWSON-STREET.

SOLD ALSO BY

HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., GRAFTON-STREET.

AND BY WILLIAMS & NORRAGE,

LONDON: | EDINBURGH:  
14, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden. | 20, South Frederick-street.

1891.

PA  
3804  
.P49



DUBLIN :  
**Printed at the University Press,**  
**BY PONSONBY AND WELDRICK.**

# “CUNNINGHAM MEMOIRS.”

---

## No. VIII.

---

ON THE FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI, By REV. JOHN P. MAHAFFY, D.D.

(With Autotypes I. to XXX.)

[Read DECEMBER 8, 1890.]

§ 1. **Introduction.**—Egypt, the land of many wonders, has at no time been more prolific in surprises than during the present generation. Not only have the indigenous records now yielded their secrets to the inquirer, but more careful and scientific search has detected mines of hidden wealth where our forefathers only saw the sands and the rocky defiles of the desert. When a nation civilized for a myriad of years has crowded a narrow country, and left records in every generation, we need hardly wonder that almost every acre of soil should hide some relic of bygone men. But when we further consider that the dryness of the climate, and the solidity of the temples and the tombs, made even the most delicate fabric everlasting, or covered it with an everlasting shelter, we feel justified in hopes which have not yet been satisfied, even after many brilliant realizations. The sudden and romantic capture of the royal mummies from their gloomy hiding place in 1881, and the appearance of the famous Rameses II. in the Boulaq Museum, followed by the very similar discovery just announced (March, 1891), from Thebes, are but the most impressive, not the most instructive, of the successes in recent Egyptology. Not only is the great Museum at Cairo one of the most wonderful in the world, though it depends for its supply upon its own country alone, but all the Museums of Europe—at

ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY.—CUNNINGHAM MEMOIRS, NO. VIII.

[1]

314671

Turin, Vienna, Rome, Paris, Berlin, London—are yearly enriching themselves with splendid Egyptian monuments and records. Nay, even private researches are producing large results; and those who had the privilege of seeing Mr. Petrie's collection last autumn in London can realize how much is still left for such an explorer to uncover and to explain. But, alas! the patient man of genius, who knows not only how to find, but how to preserve, not only how to gather, but how to distinguish, has been followed by the vulgar tourist who defaces and destroys, who by lavishing money ignorantly and at random promotes among the natives not only the practice of forging antiquities, but the habit of defacing or dividing precious documents, for the purpose of selling them in morsels. It is but recently that attention has been publicly called to the lamentable Vandalism which is daily destroying what had lasted intact for thousands of years. In this sad work foreigners have done most mischief in chipping or fracturing stone monuments; the natives, who have learned the value of papyrus rolls, have been the chief culprits in dividing or even cutting into pieces the written documents, which form so interesting a department of Egyptian antiquities.\*

§ 2. **Papyri.**—Of these the hieroglyphic or hieratic documents form a great department in themselves, from which we have learned not only the annals of the kings, but the religion of the people, the morals in which they were educated, their epic poetry, and even the fictions which amused their leisure. Nothing has contributed so much to the preservation of this mass of interesting documents, which I classified and described in a work now twenty years old,† as the excellent fibrous material discovered and used by the Egyptians, and from them carried abroad to the civilized nations of antiquity. The use of leather or parchment, and also of real paper, is indeed attested by the actual existence of two or three early hieroglyphic documents written on the former material, as well as by the scraps (of later

\* According to Volney, the first great find of papyri, in a box near Memphis, when offered for sale, and declined, was burned by the local sheiks: cf. *Notices et Extraits* of the Louvre collection, vol. xviii., pt. ii., p. 6.

† *Prolegomena to Ancient History*, Longmans, 1871. Cf. especially the last chapter. Of course many have since come to light.

date) on linen paper among the Rainer collection; but on papyrus we have many thousand texts, including the rolls found at Herculaneum, so that we may regard it as the common writing material of the ancient world, till the monopoly of its produce in the Delta produced a scarcity,\* which increased with the troubles of the world till this great manufacture became wholly extinct. The very plant which we now admire in the greenhouses of our Botanical Gardens, disappeared from Egypt, so that hardly any curiosity would now cause more interest than the finding of this natural growth on its indigenous soil. It is difficult to say how much the loss of such a portable and durable material for writing may have contributed to the decay and disappearance of learning in the dark ages.

§ 3. **Demotic Papyri.**—The earlier specimens of writing on papyrus, to which I have alluded, here concern me no longer, for I am about to describe documents written in Greek, and Greek only. But I will say a word on the intermediate stage, that of *demotic* writing, which began very early, especially for secular purposes, and lasted along with Greek till it was replaced by the Coptic of the Christian Church. In this *demotic*, or *enchorial* as it used to be called, there are indeed some novels and other literary works extant, and our bilingual inscriptions, those of Rosetta and Canopus, give their Egyptian version not only in hieroglyphics, but in the cursive script of everyday life. Business was, however, the principal subject of that demotic writing, in which contracts, bills of labour, accounts, and all fugitive memoranda were scribbled down. We find such not only on papyrus, and frequently on the back of a leaf already used for other writing, but on those potsherds known as *ostraka*, of which mounds have been recently found in several parts of Egypt. The deciphering of these fugitive demotic writings is very difficult, and unfortunately not by any means so far advanced as that of other Egyptian writing, seeing that the two greatest authorities on this point, Brugsch and Revillout, are at open variance in their interpretations. Nor can we hope to reconstruct adequately the private life of the later Egyptians till this riddle also has been satisfactorily solved. Fortunately, M. Maspero and some able younger

\* Cf. Strabo, xvii. 1, § 15.

[1\*]

men in France are now attacking the problem, and we may hope presently to have the controversies regarding it allayed and forgotten in the lessons of reliable interpretation.

**§ 4. Greek Papyri and Ostraka.**—I have delayed for a moment upon these demotic documents, because the great body of the Greek documents found in Egypt are of the same character.\* When the Macedonians conquered Egypt, and replaced the indigenous monarchy by that of the Ptolemies, the first new ruler, a sagacious and practical man, adopted as much as possible of the local traditions and habits in his system of government, and disturbed as little as possible the ordinary course of affairs. Petty magistrates were still generally Egyptians, and administered law according to Egyptian practice; all the contracts of the natives were still written in demotic, and dated in Egyptian fashion. Even when the Macedonians spread Greek through the country, and made Greek settlements in the interior, we now know that from the beginning they dated by Egyptian months, as well as Macedonian, and that the better calendar of Egypt presently replaced the Macedonian for all but solemn legal acts.† Gradually all the everyday work in the Greek-speaking towns throughout Egypt began to appear in Greek in the same way that demotic had been employed, on the backs of papyrus sheets, and upon countless potsherds. The cursive Greek upon these *ostraka* is so difficult to decipher that it required all the skill of the late Mr. Birch, of Mr. Sayce, and of M. Wilcken to detect the meaning. Similar

\* Among the many papyrus shreds of mummy-cases entrusted to me by Mr. Petrie, which I am now separating, cleaning, and reducing to order, demotic and Greek documents are found together, and in about equal quantities, but rarely on the same piece of papyrus. The demotic documents are generally on much brownier and coarser papyrus than the Greek.

† Letronne states that in all the documents known to him, he found no case of a date in Macedonian months only. “Au reste j’observe que ces doubles dates sont très rares; la plupart des pièces connues, même écrites par les Grecs, sont datées d’après le calendrier égyptien; quand à celles qui porteraient uniquement la date macédonienne, jusqu’ici je n’en connais pas une seule.” (*Comm. ad Inscript. Rosettan.* in C. Müller, *Fragg. Hist. Græc.*, I., p. 12). The dating of the wills now published seems, therefore, quite an exceptional practice, and one probably abandoned for the Egyptian month, even in such documents, under the later Ptolemies. We now have dozens of dates in Macedonian months only, but all earlier than what Letronne had examined.

difficulties encompassed the Greek papyri which had found their way to Turin, Leyden, and London—brief memoranda, accounts, lists of work and of workmen\*—in explaining which various skilful men, from the Abbé Amadeo Peyron onwards, have shown their ingenuity and acuteness.†

§ 5. **The Rainer Papyri.**—Very recently (in 1882) our materials for study have been largely increased by a mass of papyri acquired in the Fayyum, and brought to Vienna, by the Archduke Rainer; they are in many languages, and of various dates, so that a committee of experts is now publishing them systematically in a periodical specially produced for that purpose. These documents reach indeed over many centuries down to the Mahometan times, and even give us our earliest examples of Arabic; they comprise not only scraps of Hesiod and other classical poets, but even a verse or two from a Gospel earlier in date than any text we had hitherto possessed; but I am not aware that they contain dated Greek documents from any century before the Christian era.‡ We had indeed already acquired in Egypt portions of classical texts, of Homer, of Euripides, of Hypereides, of which from palæographical reasons one or two might be dated as writing of the first century B.C. But the matter was doubtful, and the great body, even of the classical fragments up to this recovered, were clearly post-

\* The abstract of a prolonged and interesting law case, with the arguments of counsel, and many documents, which A. Peyron has printed as his *Papyrus A* (*Papyri Mus. Taur.*, Turin, 1828), must evidently have been preserved in an earthen pot, as was usual in those days, and so has reached us intact. Thus in the prophet Jeremiah (xxxii. 14) we find: “Take these evidences of the purchase, . . . and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may continue many days.” But the Leyden Papyrus A, of which the special contracts have been found in other copies, stands alone for length and explicitness. Two large legal documents of the 5th century were found by Mr. Petrie preserved in this way and in a perfect condition, in 1888. They have been published by Mr. Sayce in the *Revue des Études grecques* for 1889. We have two or three smaller ones from Hawara, in what we may call a Byzantine hand, which are also tolerably complete. But they cannot be included in this Memoir.

† The later accounts and contracts of Roman and early Arab days, which are in the Rainer collection, and at Paris, have been exhaustively treated by Dr. Wessely in vol. xxxvi. of the Trans. Vienna Academy (1888)—a model for all future inquiries of the kind.

‡ In the *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzh. Rainer*, i. p. 51, it is announced that Dr. Wessely had found documents dated in the first half of the second century B.C. These seem, up to vol. v., part 2, of the *Mittheilungen* not to have been published.

Christian in date.\* As might be expected from Greek writings in Egypt at such a date, these texts, even those of Homer, the old Bible of the Greeks, were very faulty, and not to be compared with the careful MSS. which passed from Byzantium and Mount Athos into Europe at the Renascence of Greek learning. Thus Greek classical papyri, unless they gave us texts elsewhere non-existing, have not hitherto been of much value or interest to the classical scholar. But the recovery of three pages of Alcman, of a speech or two of Hypereides, of tragic fragments which we cannot as yet identify, raised the hopes of our Hellenists with the prospect of recovering some larger or older classical texts.

This was the general condition of our knowledge concerning the Greek-speaking population of Egypt which came in with the Ptolemies. The earlier and strictly local settlements at Naukratis and Daphne do not concern us here, and have been treated in very able and complete monographs by Mr. Petrie and Mr. E. Gardner.†

§ 6. **Bibliography.**—For those who desire more particular knowledge I here append a list of the publications of Ptolemaic Greek documents now accessible, to which I shall refer constantly in the following pages.

The first inquirer into this department of Egyptian history was Letronne, whose two great works, *Récherches pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte*, &c. (1823), and *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte* (1842–8), as well as his *Fragments inédits d'anciens poètes grecs*, &c. (1851), and his excellent monographs on the *Vocal Statue of Memnon*, and on the *Greek text of the Rosetta inscription* (in C. Müller's *Fräggl. Histor. Græcorum*, vol. i., appendix, 1851–3) will never be out of date.

Next comes Am. Peyron, whose *Papyri Græci Reg. Taurinensis Musei Ägyptii* (3 parts in 1 vol., Turin, 1824) is still a standard work.

Meanwhile the British Museum papyri had been published for the Trustees by Jos. Forshall (Part i., 1829); and in the same year appeared,

\* This is the case also with the recently discovered *Polity of the Athenians*, the lost tract attributed to Aristotle which has been recently published by the Trustees of the British Museum. The MS. is not earlier than 80–100 A.D.

† See the publications of the Egypt Exploration Society, vols. iii. and vi.

from the pen of Reuvens, *Lettres à M. Letronne sur les papyrus bilingues du Musée de Leide* (1829), followed by C. Leemans *Papyri Græci Musei Lugdunensis Bat.* (Leyden, 1829; 2nd series, 1885).

The Louvre papyri are fac-similed and commented on in vol. xviii. of the *Notices et Extraits* published by the French Government from that great collection, with a separate volume of transliteration and commentary by Letronne and Brunet de Presle, 1858. Since that we have also Miller's *Mélanges de Litt. grecque*, and E. Egger's Essay (*Journal des Savants*, 1873), on the *Papyri Sakkini*.

The vastly increased treasures of the British Museum are at this moment in process of being autotyped and published by the great specialists of that Institution.

The first attempts to produce the Berlin fragments was made by Parthey in 1864 (*Egypt. Personen-namen, &c.*), 1865 (the magical papyri),\* and in 1869.

These older sources, all relating to a very restricted group of papyri found at Thebes or Memphis, and mostly belonging to the Serapeum, but if restricted, for that reason elucidating each other, have told us of the Pagan monastic life and its difficulties, of the grasping spirit of corporations, and the difficulties of obtaining legal redress, of the value of house and landed property, &c., under the seventh and eighth Ptolemies. We may add A. Bœckh's great *Corpus Inscript. Græc.*, vol. iii., Nos. 4677–4978, relating to Egypt; for though he does not profess to give anything but inscriptions upon stone, he prints among them fac-similes of cursive notes, especially from Philæ, which are of great use in deciphering the more fugitive writings on papyrus and on the ostraka.

The same thing may be said of Ad. Schmidt's *Forschungen*, and of Lepsius' splendid *Denkmäler*, in the latter of which many of the texts already published by Letronne, notably those scratched upon the statue of

\* The magical papyri—a large and special inquiry—are now best studied in the 2nd part of of Leemans' *Leiden Papyri*, and in the masterly article of Dr. Wessely, in vol. xxxvi. of the Trans. Vienna Acad. (1888), who there prints a perfect volume of hymns, incantations, and other curious texts hitherto lying unpublished in the collections of London and Paris, with a very careful index.

Memnon, were fac-similed to perfection. Lepsius also gave us the Greek, as well as the Egyptian, text of the *Inscription of Canopus* in a monograph (*Das Dekret von Canopus*, Berlin, 1866). The more recent literature upon it has been cited by W. N. Groff, in the *Revue égyptologique*, vi. 1, p. 12.

But for some years there was a lull in these studies, for no good fortune added to the celebrated Anastasi collection, which formed the staple of the publications I have named, in which the earlier Ptolemaic days were not at all represented—the Canopus stone giving us, for the first time, a dated document of the third Ptolemy in his ninth year. Still there were occasional discoveries of scraps of Homer, of Euripides, and of other classical writers, which encouraged the hopes of European scholars that in the tombs of Coptic days, when men seem to have sometimes had their books buried with them, treasure might yet be found. These hopes were raised to the highest pitch by the appearance of the Rainer papyri,\* which are, indeed, most various and curious, but too fragmentary and lacerated to be in any sense satisfactory, and almost all dating from centuries posterior to the Christian era—the best of them were from the third and fourth centuries. Meanwhile, Dr. U. Wilcken had also turned his attention to the masses of ostraka inscribed with Greek writing, many of which were discovered by Mr. Sayce.

The newer results have been published as follows:—Prof. Wilcken, in a Latin monograph, *Observ. ad hist. Ægypt. prov. Rom.* (Berlin, 1885), then *Arsinoitische Tempelrechnungen* (*Hermes* xx. and xxi.), *Aktenstücke, &c.*, in Trans. Berlin Academy for 1886, and quite recently *Tafeln zur älteren griechischen Palæographie*, a useful work based altogether on Egyptian documents; Dr. C. Wessely, *die Griech. Pap. der K. K. Sammlung Wien's* (1875), and since in *Wiener Studien*, vols. iii. *sqq.*, and especially vol. viii. and ix. (1886–7), as well as in Karabaçeks *Rainer Papyri*, vols. i.–v. (especially i. 30 *sqq.*), and in his exhaustive monograph on the acquisitions of Papyri from the Fayyum (Trans. Vienna Academy, 1888). By the acuteness of these scholars, following as they did in the track of Leemans (*Leiden Papyri*, i. p. 92), and A. Peyron in Parts 2 and 3 of his *Pap. Taur.*,

\* The general account of this discovery was read by Karabaçek before the Vienna Academy (Transactions for 1882, pp. 207 *sqq.*). He there cites the earlier partial accounts (p. 208).

and by the independent researches of A. H. Sayce in the fifth chapter of Mr. Flinders Petrie's *Hawara, Biahmi, and Arsinoe* (1889), and of E. Revillout (*Revue égyptolog.*, 1883, vol. iii. 51 *sqq.*), many signs for measures and sums of money have been determined. Thus we have reached the threshold of that epoch in the discovery and reading of Græco-Egyptian papyri, which is due to the labours of Mr. Flinders Petrie.

§ 7. **Mr. Petrie at Gurob.**—In two earlier volumes, a *Winter in Egypt* (1887), and *Hawara, Biahmi, and Arsinoe* (1889), Mr. Petrie had shown how much there was of interest in the Fayyum, which had not, he says, been examined for 25 years. The fresh and picturesque account of his labours is so recent, and so readily accessible, that I need only refer to his books, and especially to the fifth chapter in the latter work, where Mr. Sayce has given an account of the important fragment of the *Iliad* (from Books i. and ii.) found in a coffin under a lady's head, and of many lists of prices and accounts, which are described as blowing about the desert on fragments of papyrus. Mr. Sayce rightly says that the political economy and social life under the Ptolemies, which Lumbroso\* had so ably discussed with insufficient materials, may now be examined with larger and more minute evidence, and that we shall soon know all about prices, taxes, rates of labour, and local administration, from the accumulation of these documents, of which Leemans gave long ago the first important specimens. I will not speak of the curious specimens of Romano-Egyptian portrait-painting on the mummy cases, and the other curiosities brought from Hawara. The following winter's work at Tell Gurob (or Kurob) led to still more astonishing results. So far as I gathered from his personal account,† the coffins at Hawara were of wood, whereas in the necropolis of Tell Gurob they were made of layers of papyrus, torn into small pieces, and stuck together so as to form a thick carton, painted within and without with designs and religious emblems. These carton-cases were made to fit the swathed body; there are at present in my possession several portions rounded to fit the skull, with

\* *Récherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*, Turin, 1870.

† The volume containing the record of Mr. Petrie's work in 1889 (*Kahun, Gurob, Hawara*), just published (May, 1891), reserves all mention of the tombs at Gurob for another volume.

even the face shaped and painted, and others fitted to the feet. It was in the structure of these cases that Mr. Petrie detected the use of discarded documents, and forthwith attempted the difficult task of separating and cleaning the various fragments. Most of them were hopelessly destroyed. The thick layer of white chalk or lime laid upon the papyri to form the surface for colouring has in most cases destroyed the ink, if the written surface of the papyrus lay outward. When the several layers were glued together, the binding substance is very strong, and the worms in search of the glue have riddled the whole texture. There are many cases where steeping in water discloses some substance which dissolves into dark-brown juice, and stains the papyrus so as to make all characters illegible. I can speak of these difficulties from personal experience, for Mr. Petrie left in my hands a large number of unseparated fragments of these mummy cases, and I know how hopeless it is in most cases to save anything from the wreck.

Neither he nor I at first knew that this source of possible knowledge concerning the Greeks of Egypt had been discussed by the famous Letronne sixty years ago, for it was only in searching through the older literature of the subject, that I found, in his *Lettre à M. Passelacqua*, printed by M. Brunet de Presle, in the 18th vol. of the *Notices et Extraits* of the Paris MSS., the following prophetic words (p. 410) :—

“ Quant aux nombreux fragments de papyrus (No. 1564) qui ont servi à former le cartonnage d'une momie, ils sont beaucoup trop mutilés pour qu'on en puisse tirer rien de suivi ; on ne voit sur les plus étendus que quelques portions de lignes dont il est impossible de tirer un sens complet. Je me suis donc attaché uniquement à deviner quel a pu être le sujet du papyrus auquel chacun de ces fragments a appartenu ; car il eût été curieux de savoir si quelqu'un d'entre eux avait appartenu à une composition littéraire. Mais je n'en ai pas trouvé de trace : tous ces papyrus paraissent avoir rapport à des contrats de vente, à des transactions particulières et à des circulaires administratives. Peut-être, (he adds prophetically) les voyageurs, examinant avec soin les enveloppes de ce genre, trouveront-ils des morceaux où au moins les lignes seront entières. Toutefois je ne croirais pas avoir perdu mon temps si ce que je viens de dire engageait ceux qui exploitent, à Thèbes, une mine si féconde, à

suivre votre exemple et à faire quelque attention aux momies dont les enveloppes seraient formées avec des papyrus; car on ignorait jusqu' ici que *les vieux papiers* avaient quelquefois, en Égypte, cet emploi final."

It seems that, in spite of this advice, the world of antiquarians left Mr. Petrie to rediscover what Passelacqua had already ascertained. I can only congratulate the present age on being more fortunate than that of Letronne. The large supply of such materials since sent to me by Mr. Petrie has indeed only supplied the very kinds which disappointed Letronne—accounts, private letters, and legal reports. But as Letronne adds in conclusion:—" Il est difficile de trouver en Égypte une seule ligne de grec qui ne révèle quelque particularité intéressante pour l'histoire, la langue, ou la connaissance des usages."

§ 8. **The Gurob Papyri.**—Owing, therefore, to Mr. Petrie's good fortune and great care in doing this work, a large number of texts were rescued from oblivion and brought home by him to England, where, with the help of Mr. Sayce and myself they were sorted, and the process of deciphering them was begun. Seldom has it fallen to the lot of modern scholars to spend such days as we spent together at Oxford in the Long Vacation of 1890: poring all day, while the sun shone, over these faint and fragmentary records; discussing in the evening the stray lights we had found and their possible significance. Gradually pieces of a Platonic dialogue emerged, which presently we determined to be the *Phædo*; then a leaf of a tragic poem, identified beyond question as the *Antiope* of Euripides; and with these were many legal or official documents with dates, which arrested and surprised us. For instead of the late Ptolemies, or the Roman emperors, whose names occur in the Greek papyri already found, here we could read nothing but *Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy Soter, and Ptolemy the son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, brother gods*—in other words, the second and third kings in the series (280–220 B.C.). There could then be no doubt whatever of the significance of the discovery. As there were no dates to be found later than the third Ptolemy, it followed with moral certainty that the classical texts mixed up with these documents could not be younger than 220 B.C. The character in which both the Platonic and the

[2\*]

Euripidean fragments were written, pointed to even an older generation. Neither of them is in any sense cursive; they show forms hardly changed from the lapidary style; and as they can hardly be younger than 250 B.C., so they may even then have been imported into Egypt by the soldiers of fortune who came from all parts of the Greek world, among whose papers they were found. But the palaeography of the second and third centuries B.C. (except on stone or bronze) is so novel a field, that we must proceed with the greatest caution.

It is due to the liberality of the Royal Irish Academy that I am able to publish autotype reproductions of a large number of dated papers—letters, accounts of work, testaments, and records of legal decisions. The great difficulties which were encountered in photographing these yellow and faint fragments, in which the fibre is apt to produce shadows which conceal the writing, have been marvellously overcome by the care and skill of the Autotype Company, under the watchful and able direction of Dr. Maunde Thompson, who volunteered to superintend this part of the work. Many of the Autotypes are as clear as the originals; in all, the student will see enough to justify the decipherment, though many syllables may appear to him effaced, which can still be read.

The variety in the writing of these documents, even in those dated the same year, shows that we are dealing with a society where writing was widely diffused, and practised with great freedom.\* Still the student will look in vain, except in a few very small cursive notes, for any handwriting of the excessive difficulty found in the Leyden and British Museum documents which are subsequent to the seventh Ptolemy. Contractions had not yet come into use in copying legal documents; the names of priests and the details in giving the dates, are not abridged or slurred over; when the characters are not effaced they can usually be read with ordinary care. But without the right clue all cursive writing is most difficult, and I shall never forget the sense of relief when I guessed the formula **NΩN KAI ΦPONΩN** to be that of a testator—*being of sound mind and clear understanding*—and so broke the seals which hid from me a long series of important texts. The recurrence of fixed formulæ is of course a great help in discoveries

\* Cf. U. Wilcken's *Observationes*, p. 35, on this subject.

of this kind. The smallest fragment of one of these, when deciphered, may give the key for the yet illegible remainder, and tell how many letters have been lost in a mutilated line. The mere name of a priest of Alexander, or a Canephorus of Arsinoe Philadelphus, when once identified, may tell the year of the king, and fix the date as perfectly as if we possessed the whole formula. Interesting variations in the fixed phrases of some of the legal documents will in due time come under discussion.

I have already mentioned the store of unseparated fragments, sent to me by Mr. Petrie upon his departure for Egypt in November, 1890, which I am now endeavouring daily to explicate and to read. But this new task, with its possibilities and hopes, cannot be recorded in the present Memoir, which, indeed, already contains materials enough to satisfy the most exacting lover of antiquarian novelties.

§ 9. **Classification of the Texts.**—The order which I have adopted in treating of this great variety of documents is the following:—I have put first the classical texts, as they will probably interest the largest number of my readers, and have separated them into poetry and prose. The fragments of the *Antiope* accordingly come first (I. and II.), and then two brief scraps of Epicharmus and Euripides, and of dramatic authors I cannot identify (III. and IV.). Next come the prose remains, viz. the fragments of Plato's *Phædo* (V.—VIII.), followed by a page from a discourse on good-fellowship (*φιλεταιρία*), and by a couple of other scraps, one of which seems to be a description of the funeral customs of various nations (IX.—X.). To these must be added one of the fragments on XXIV., which contains a text to be found in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, and which therefore represents the original of Alkidamas, from which the author of the extant tract is known to have copied. This group, showing us the literary furniture of the Fayyum veterans, seems to me to have been written in the hand of many of our dated fragments, whereas both the *Antiope* and the *Phædo* show a certain contrast in their more finished calligraphy to the rest of these documents.

Turning next to the everyday papers of the Greeks in the *Arsinoitic nome*, we are naturally first attracted by a long series of wills, or rather official

copies of wills, which have no parallel, so far as I know, in any of the Greek papyri hitherto known, except so far as they are legal documents in the form of contracts, with details of property, and signed by witnesses fully described. As a large number of these copies was entered in each year, and in parallel columns, upon the official sheets which have come into our possession, we can not only produce handwritings of several definite years, especially in the third Ptolemy's reign, but we can even show the varieties of writing which existed at the same moment in this corner of the Greek world in the third century before Christ. From a palæographical point of view this information is not only entirely new, but of the last importance. It will enable us to fix approximately the age of classical papyri found, or yet to be found, in Egypt;\* and these clear and more explicit documents will help to explain the crabbed and difficult abbreviations so puzzling in later papyri. For in this age, though there was small cursive writing to me almost undecipherable, the use of abbreviations appears almost unknown. Except for the word *year*, for the names of coins and measures (*drachme, artaba, &c.*) and for some military title, which is represented by a hieroglyph (cf. XI., lines 13, 19, 21), I cannot cite any instance of abbreviations in what I have been able to read.† But I shall postpone further observations upon the palæographical side of these discoveries to the close of this Memoir.

I begin with two fragments which have lost their date, because I think

\* Thus a letter published in Leemans' collection (Pap. Q.), and dated the 26th year of a Philadelphus, whom he takes to be the third of that title (Ptolemy Dionysos) seems to me, from the likeness of the hand to that of a letter I have reproduced (XXIX.), to date 200 years earlier, and to belong to the days of the first Philadelphus (Ptolemy II.). I have since found that this conjecture, made purely upon palæographical grounds, is independently maintained by Revillout (*Rev. égyptol.* iii. 83) with several weighty arguments, and assumed as proved by Wilcken (*Tafeln*, p. x. (δ)). In the forthcoming publication of the British Museum papyri, there are also one or two documents, which Dr. Maunde Thompson, by the light of the new evidence produced in this Memoir, places in the third century B.C. The Sakkini (or Sakkakini) Papyrus, to which E. Egger (*op. cit.*) could give no definite date, is undoubtedly not later than the third, and probably of the second, Ptolemy's time.

† I have since found in the heading of an account dated the 20th year of Ptolemy III. (226 B.C.) εν κροκοδιλων ρ̄ which must be a rough sketch of Πτ = πολει: cf. the π found in some of the cursive alphabets reproduced at end of this memoir.

their handwriting points to one differing somewhat from the rest, and because internal evidence leads me to ascribe this date to the earliest period of the settlement. The details I shall give in their proper place. I proceed with the fragments of dated wills, from the 10th, 12th, and 22nd years of the third Ptolemy (237, 235, 225 b.c.), to which I add one or two pieces interesting either for their contents or for their peculiar handwriting. XXII. and XXIII. give us a bill of labour in a very early cursive hand, dated the 36th year of the second Ptolemy, and seem to refer to the marking out of the lots to the settlers in the Fayyum. There follow a number of brief legal documents (XXIV.—XXVII.) chiefly records of judgments, or of public works, some of which reach back to the earlier years of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

This selection from the mass of papyri before me, though it comprises so many pieces of large interest, is by no means complete. The accounts of overseers (such as XXIII.) and tax-gatherers, which Mr. Sayce has taken for his special study, are both numerous and important, and will be made by him the subject of special publications, which will also include many interesting private letters, of which he has already given specimens in this year's number (xvii.) of *Hermathena*. They are very analogous to the letters in the Louvre collection. Of these letters, I have also given two specimens (XXIX., XXX.), and should have given more had I had access to the papers locked up at Oxford, and awaiting his return. But to describe all the texts of our discovery in the present Report would both tax the liberality of the Academy, already so largely vouchsafed, beyond all fair limits, and would, moreover, impose upon me a task requiring years of time and of special studies. I have indeed frequently paused during the preparation of the present Memoir, and asked myself whether some more experienced palaeographer should not have undertaken it. But it was hard to refuse so tempting a piece of work, first generously accorded to me by the gifted discoverer and his counsellor, Mr. Sayce; then supported by the enlightened liberality of the Royal Irish Academy, whose President and Council have prompted this publication; I have been advised, moreover, by the unfailing courtesy and the large experience of Dr. Maunde Thompson, of the British Museum,

and aided with assiduity and care by several of my younger colleagues in Trinity College, whose names will frequently appear in the following pages. And if I have thus been the means of bringing this remarkable discovery to the great Irish seats of learning, I have at least done my utmost to secure its prompt transmission to the world. It will be the province of greater experts to fill up the gaps which are still left in the interpretation of these priceless documents.

I have given as far as I could a transcription of the text of each fragment into ordinary Greek letters, and when desirable a translation—not, of course, of the *Phædo*, of which good translations are easily accessible. In the *Antiope* fragments, I have only transcribed the very letters I could read, now more correctly and fully than before, and have given all conjectures and emendations in the annexed Commentary.\* Several imperfections in my former transcript, owing to the letters being disguised by small fragments of clay of exactly the same colour as the papyrus, have now been removed. In the other Autotypes I have supplied the missing parts either from our received texts of Plato, or from the study of parallel documents which suggest the missing words, especially in the wills. In this work, I cannot hope to have avoided mistakes; I shall only quote the words with which the Abbé Peyron concludes a kindred inquiry: “Superest, ut viri docti æqui bonique faciant conatus meos. Ac facient profecto si secum recognitent prima tentamina in re non bene perspecta optima esse, si mediocritatem attingant.” I have not always found my critics so reasonable.

It now only remains for me to add some account of what we already know, or may fairly infer, from these texts, concerning the history and condition of the Greek society in the Fayyum in the days of the early Ptolemies.

§ 10. **Historical—Ptolemy Philadelphus.**—A brief survey of the reigns of the two Ptolemies with whom we are concerned will be sufficient.

\* I need hardly remind the reader, that with very faint traces before us, the divining of the sense often precedes the correct decipherment. But the divination which can be tested by the extant vestiges of the text are far more satisfactory than those which demand assent on purely subjective grounds.

I have already discussed their position in the Hellenistic world in another work;\* and those who desire fuller details will find the chronology in Clinton, and the political and economic details discussed in Droysen's *Geschichte des Hellenismus*. The only English history of the Ptolemies is in Sharpe's *History of Egypt*, a meritorious but now superannuated book.

The second Ptolemy, who was the first to call himself Philadelphus, owing to his strong attachment to his second queen, Arsinoe, who was also his full sister, succeeded to the throne upon the abdication of his father Ptolemy Soter in 284 B.C., and reigned till 247–6 B.C. Though Soter died within two years of his abdication, it seems, from the researches of M. Revillout and some earlier numismatists (*Études égyptol.*, vol. i., pp. 12 *sqq.*), that his name was used upon coins and in official proclamations for several years longer. This fact is important, and perplexing in determining various chronological questions. Thus there is a difficulty, of which more presently, about the closing year of the third Ptolemy, which is perhaps caused by this practice.

Ptolemy Philadelphus succeeded to a prosperous empire, a full treasury, an efficient army. The great troubles caused by the invasion of the Galatæ (278 B.C.) into Macedonia, Greece, and Asia Minor soon passed away. He had indeed pretended, through the mouth of his court poets, to have been one of the liberators of Hellenism from the Galatian fury, but his part in the transaction seems to have been no more glorious than to hire 2000 of the barbarians as mercenaries, and then, when they grew turbulent and dangerous, to have them massacred on an island of the Nile. Throughout his long reign he was never engaged in any great war, all his policy being one of diplomacy, of aiding the arms of allies by subsidies, of creating a balance of power between Macedon and Syria, of commanding with his fleet the coasts of the Ægean, and thus supporting his many Greek allies. Cyprus and Cyrene only caused him passing troubles.

I cannot but feel that his second wife Arsinoe, who attained so exceptional a position as to make a new precedent for all the succeeding Ptolemaic queens, giving them titular equality with their husbands, may

\* *Greek Life and Thought, from the death of Alexander to the Roman Conquest*, chaps. ix. and x.

have owed her importance to her diplomatic talents, and to her development of this peace policy. She founded cities called by her name, as far away as Boeotia,\* and the very district which specially concerns us—the Fayyum—was renamed in her day the *Arsinoitic nome*.† Can we show any reasons why this might seem appropriate? Why should the old Egyptian name be abandoned, and the nome cease to be called after its capital, the city of the Crocodiles? If Arsinoe Philadelphus was indeed the author or promoter of the peace policy of her brother, with its subtle and brilliant diplomacy, she was probably also the cause of the diminution of the enormous standing army which paraded the streets of Alexandria at the coronation of the new king.‡ And this army was not only dismissed with handsome gifts, but its veterans, from what the present papers tell us, were settled as landed proprietors and pensioners in the fertile slopes around the famous Lake Moeris.

We know from the somewhat parallel case of the settlement of Caesar's veterans in Italy, what such a military colonization meant in ancient times. The Sovran, or the State, being the owner in theory of all or most of the land, of which the occupier was only the tenant, even after centuries of settled life, acknowledged no fixity of tenure, and no compensation for disturbance. We know that the first Ptolemy had wisely changed as little as he could of the internal government of the Pharaohs. So also it is not known to us that he made any new Greek settlement in the country except at Ptolemais, and perhaps Thebes (Diospolis), which had fallen into decay, and found its population too small for its magnificent buildings.

§ 11. **The Military Settlement in Arsinoe.**—But all the acts of Philadelphus show a far greater contempt for the conquered nation, and a more determined policy of Hellenizing the country. Hence he did not scruple to dispossess the native farmers of the Fayyum, and establish in

\* I have elsewhere conjectured that the founding of cities in far away countries was for the purpose of obtaining a legal voice in the deliberations of local Hellenistic Federations, which were thus brought under the influence of Egyptian diplomacy.

† The capital, known to Strabo as Arsinoe, is never so called in the following documents, but always Crocodilopolis.

‡ Cf. my *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 200–205.

his renamed nome of Arsinoe, as landlords (*κληροῦχοι*), a large body of his veterans, whose regiments are mentioned in their family papers. We may assume this important innovation to have taken place after his second marriage, and therefore not before the 16th or 17th year of his reign,\* for with the renaming came the repopulating of the district. The earliest date I have yet found among these papers seems to be his 16th year (cf. XXIII., and the commentary thereon), and most of the records which refer to quarrels among these landowners date from his 35–37th years. I note that in the following reign the *cleruchs*, who appear as testators or witnesses, are usually described as 70 years old or upwards. If we imagine them disbanded after reasonable service,† but still young enough to be enterprising settlers, we may place the colony about 35 years earlier. This computation, reckoning back from the year 10 of the third Ptolemy (237 b. c.), will bring us to about 270 b. c., which corresponds with the conjecture I have made upon other grounds.

The position I have maintained, that in the ΚΛΗΡΟΥΧΟΙ we have the original military settlers, is confirmed by the use of another title in connexion with it. If the witness be not a *cleruch*, he is usually called a member ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΟΝΗΣ, of the second generation, or the second enlistment—a term which was already known, and has been much discussed, but without any certain conclusion being attained.‡ The details of the question will be given in the description of the wills below, § 21. I note that the people with this title are a generation younger than the *cleruchs*, and that as the sons of *cleruchs* should have been of this age, there is no impossibility in interpreting the term as merely the second generation. But the many difficulties which stand in the way must not now detain us. The original

\* 268–7 b.c. The date of Philadelphus' second marriage is stated by M. Revillout to have been his 16th year, but I cannot find his authority. The early tragedies of this Arsinoe's life were over in 277 b.c., and she seems then to have gone home to her brother in Egypt. His mother Berenice did not die till the 16th year, and her feelings should no doubt have been opposed to his incestuous marriage. But all this is conjecture.

† The youngest I find mentioned is 30 years old, but also an officer (XI., l. 18).

‡ A. Peyron, *op. cit.* ii. 7, B. Peyron, *op. cit.* pp. 42–45, Boeckh, CIG iii. 287, with many references.

[3\*]

homes of these colonists are generally stated in descriptions of them—*e.g.* Paris, the son of Theophilus, the Arcadian, or the Thracian, or the Libyan, or the Argive.\* I shall give a complete list in its place, and here remark that this society was made up of mercenary soldiers, not only from all parts of the Hellenistic world, but from the outlying countries, whose inhabitants would have been thought essentially inferior, and unfit for a civilized polity, in earlier Greek days. Many are Macedonians, and belong to the cavalry, and even the household cavalry, so that they must have been considered quite aristocratic; they retained their houses in Alexandria, and no doubt their special rights as citizens of that capital. The only noteworthy limitation in the list is the absence (perhaps accidental in these stray remnants) of all Semitic, as well as Egyptian names.†

The veterans were not settled throughout the rich fields and slopes of the Fayyum without many quarrels and controversies. Fragments remain of complaints about illegal occupation, about the taxes to be paid on produce, about the rights of inheritance and the lots of land. One hundred *arouræ*, or Egyptian acres, seem to have been the amount of the largest original grants, and as the fertile oasis about the lake measured about 40 miles by 20, there would be room for a great number of landlords, apart from those who settled about the city of Crocodilopolis, and pursued the various industries for which villages in the suburbs seem to have been set apart by common consent. Strabo, who visited the district at the end of the first century b. c. (two and a-half centuries after the settlement), observes that here only in Egypt wine and (olive) oil‡ were largely produced. It is natural to

\* In many cases they may have merely migrated from other parts of Egypt—*e.g.* Ἐλευσίνος, Φιλαδέλφεος, perhaps Ἀνδρομάχειος, but this, if really the case, only accounts for very few of the names.

† A Persian seems to occur (XIV. 29), and B. Peyron (*op. cit.* p. 42) quotes from a Leyden Pap. Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγόνης. We know that ἐπίγονοι was the title given by Alexander himself to his Persian levies. A fragment since found (cf. § 21, p. 43) tells us that Jews were settled with the Greeks in one village at least—Psenuris—in the Fayyum.

‡ Castor oil (*κικί*) is constantly mentioned in private accounts, and was evidently a necessary of life for lamps, though useless for food, as Pliny and Dioscorides (*Mat. Med.* iv. 161) tell us. It is called Ricinum by the former; cf. *Hist. Nat.* xv. 7, where he says: *cibis fædum, lucernis utile.*

attribute this peculiarity to the great Greek settlement under the second Ptolemy, whose colonists would introduce the favourite growths of Greece and Asia Minor into their new homes. We know indeed from the Rosetta inscription,\* from old Egyptian pictures, and statements of Biblical and classical authors, that wine was used in the country; but the climate does not suit vines very well; the old intoxicating beverage of the Pharaohs—*haq*—was made from grain, and not from grapes. Wine, therefore, probably remained a luxury, except in the Fayyūm, where Strabo saw it produced in abundance. We have among our documents many allusions to both olives and vines, and I may refer especially to the letter (XXIX.) on the subject.

The reader should note the peculiar configuration of the district (of which a map is given at the end), which perhaps alone in Egypt affords those irrigated slopes upon which vines are best cultivated. The oasis is a great hollow cup in the desert, so deep below the level of the high Nile, that during every inundation a vast body of water passes down a branch to Hawara, which is 12 feet lower, and then by circular canals round the oasis down to the lake, of which the bottom is 200 feet below the high Nile level, and even 130 below that of the Mediterranean. So vast was the space occupied by this famous lake, Herodotus's Lake Mœris, that the earliest efforts of the Egyptian kings, notably of Amenemha III., in the XIIth dynasty, were directed to limit its size, and reclaim the land which had been enriched by the deposit of so many water-courses descending through the country. A great dyke was built, to limit the lake towards the south; and here the capital of the district—the Greek Crocodilopolis, the present Medinet-el-Fayyūm—still testifies its former importance by the enormous mounds upon the site. Here too, close to Hawara, was the famous Labyrinth, about which so much has been said by classical authors.†

On these slopes then Ptolemy's veterans made the natives cultivate for

\* l. 15 [τὰς ἀπομοίρας] ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμπελίτιδος γῆς, καὶ τῶν παραδείσων.

† I take these details from Mr. Petrie's recent account in his *Hawara, Biahmi, and Arsinoe* (Trübner, 1889), in which he prints a most interesting description by Colonel Ross. There is also a very ample description in Baedeker's *Egypt*, pp. 456 *sqq.*, which, however, differs in several important details from Colonel Ross's account. I have followed the latter.

them oil and wine, in addition to the ordinary products of the country. While the natives still made their contracts in demotic, all the official documents of the colony were in Greek, and though in dating letters and contracts, the Egyptian month was given with the Macedonian, and often indeed by itself, we find the testamentary dates of the third Ptolemy's reign exclusively Macedonian. The language of these documents is fluent, and evidently that of a population which spoke Greek as a mother-tongue; even in the formulæ of the wills we find many small variations, showing that these formulæ were not slavishly used, but understood by the testator. State documents of the period, such as the inscription of Canopus, show that very long periods were written correctly in official circles—at least as correctly as our official classes use English. There are a few new words, not to be found even in the elaborate Lexicon of Gleanings, in which Professor Komanudis has gathered some 6000 words from beyond the pale of *Liddell and Scott*. But as yet there is little trace of that Egyptian influence which in the course of centuries told upon even these higher classes. The names of workmen and of petty overseers are Egyptian; measures and weights at least partially so; the laws are adaptations of the old régime to Macedonian titles and ideas. As has already been observed, the local administration generally remained what it had been under the Pharaohs; so it lasted under the Romans, even down to the Arab conquest.

§ 12. **Ptolemy Euergetes I.** (246–221 b.c.)—We now come to the reign of the third Ptolemy, within which most of our papyri are dated. I do not know whether among the notes and letters which Mr. Sayce is still deciphering, very early years of this king may not be explicitly mentioned. As every king of the series lived a few years, small figures without further specification tell us nothing; whereas such numbers as 35 added to the sign for a *year*, limit the possible application to very few kings indeed; and fortunately we have, in the famous Canopus inscription, an elaborate statement of all the means for fixing a year known in those days. The Egyptian priests then issued a proclamation in which they voted sundry divine honours to the king and queen, and made ordinances that these honours should be kept on days determined according to the

reformed calendar of  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days, not according to the old Egyptian calendar of 365. Lepsius, in his monograph on the decree above mentioned, has fixed the date of this decree—the ninth year of Ptolemy III. (Euergetes)—as 238 b. c.

I shall here write out the full formula, which bears upon the dating of many of the following documents, premising that the Brother\* Gods (**ΘΕΟΙ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ**) mean the deified Philadelphus and Arsinoe, and the Benefactor Gods (**ΘΕΟΙ ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΑΙ**) mean the deified reigning king and queen. “In the reign of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe the brother gods, the 9th year, Apollonides son of Moschion being priest of Alexander [the Great] and of the Gods Brothers and the Gods Benefactors; the Canephorus [priestess] of Arsinoe Philadelphus being Menekrateia, the daughter of Philammon, in the month Tybi, &c. &c.” The dating of the Rosetta inscription is on the same principle, except that the priesthoods created in honour of the intervening kings and queens during the next fifty years have been added, thus making the preamble too tedious for me to quote. So much was this felt even in Egypt that in later documents no care was taken to find out the names of the priests and priestesses officiating in the particular year, but they are spoken of as ‘the existing’ (**ΤΩΝ ΟΝΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚΩΝ**). In still more compendious copies of legal instruments we have even the phrase *after the general formulæ* (**ΜΕΤΑ ΤΑ ΚΟΙΝΑ**) into which the preamble is curtailed.†

These details I here give because the reader must be satisfied that I have really determined the early date of the papyri in this Report. If he will turn to the wills of the year 10 of Ptolemy III. (XIV., XV., XVI.), he will find the formula of the Canopus inscription repeated word for word, even to the names of Apollonides and Menekrateia, the *eponymous* priest and priestess of the year, with merely the figure 9 changed to 10, and the note that one or both priesthoods were now being held for their second year—a most exceptional circumstance. For *eponymous* priesthoods would obviously

\* The German *Geschwister* would be a better translation of **ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ**, which here means brother and sister.

† Cf. examples of both these compendious expressions in Leemans' *Leiden Papyri*, N. and O., which date from the seventh or a later Ptolemy.

be useless if the same names were frequently repeated. The Canopic decree of the priests in the year 9 mentions two circumstances which may have caused a reappointment of the eponymous officers for the next year. Firstly, new honours and dignities were heaped on the king and queen, and perhaps the priest and priestess may have claimed the first performance of the accompanying ceremonies. Secondly, there were special changes made in the estimating of the year—which in the case of the new honours was henceforth to be the solar, not the Egyptian year—and this may possibly have caused the prolongation, or apparent prolongation of offices shortened or altered in their tenure by these changes. These, however, are only suggestions which may help to explain an undoubted fact. In another document (XXVIII. (2)) we have ΛΙΑ ΩC ΔΕ . . . οΔοι ΛΙB, viz. year 11, but, according to . . . περίοδοι? year 12, which seems to me to allude to the new uncertainty introduced by the decree of the year 9.

The habit of dating, not only by the year of the king and the day of the month, but also by the names of eponymous priesthoods, was common to the old Greek and Asiatic worlds. We can see specimens of it in Thucydides and elsewhere, and when there was no recognized epoch, the coincidence of several priests and priestesses who were appointed in various months might limit the time very closely. Thus, if the priesthood of Alexander and the Canephoria of Arsinoe were independent creations in relation to independent feasts, the coincidence of the Priest A with the Canephorus B might only extend over a few months, and so define the date more precisely. For example, in the document just cited, which hesitates between the year 11 and 12, Seleucus is the priest, while we know that in the year 12 Eukles was priest and Stratonice Canephorus; unfortunately the name of the Canephorus coincident with Seleucus is lost. Similarly, in the wills of the year 10, the Canephorus is sometimes in her second year, while the priest is not ; if this were not due to an oversight, it establishes my conjecture. I have already mentioned how the multiplication of these priesthoods for the successive kings, while useless in further determining a date perfectly settled by the year and day of the king, became so cumbrous as to be curtailed, and even omitted. I will only add that the earliest Canephorus as yet ascertained is, according to M. Revillout, in the 19th

year of Ptolemy Philadelphus,\* therefore but a few years after the promotion of the second Arsinoe to be his queen. We may suppose that she was deified and honoured in this way upon her marriage.

One other chronological question must be raised before we return to the events of Ptolemy Euergetes' life.† The chronologers agree in allotting 25 years to his reign, but if we are to believe the transcription, by the monk Cosmas, of the inscription he saw at Adule,‡ it was dated in his 27th year. There seems to be some inaccuracy here; but if we allow 25 years, it is not at all impossible that he may have reached the early days of his 26th year, seeing that the remainder would (according to the received precedent) count a full first year with the new king. What, then, are we to think of documents produced below (XI.), dated, simply, *year 26*? are they of this king's reign, or 38 years earlier, and to be referred to the second Ptolemy? On this point I feel much hesitation, and have not assigned the earlier date to any document which does not bear some additional internal evidence to support me.

§ 13. **Character of his Reign.**—The reign which has now supplied us with so many dated documents commenced in stormy excitement. Not only did the young and vigorous man succeed to one worn out with long dissipation, ill-health, and the fatigues of government, but the new king was hurried off at the very commencement of his reign into an Asiatic campaign, which turned out only inferior in brilliancy and success to those of Alexander—if we believe the Adule inscription and the priests—and from which he came back loaded with spoil, and covered with glory, restoring to the Egyptians the gods and sacred treasures carried away long since by the victorious Persians. But from this time onward we

\* The document (XXIII.) which I date in the 16th year of this king has accordingly no Canephorus, but apparently it has a priest of Alexander and the Brother Gods, which would disprove M. Revillout's theory that this latter office was probably created in the 20th year of Philadelphus: cf. *Revue égyptol.*, vol. i., pp. 12 *sqq.*

† As we have here nothing to say to Euergetes II., I need not repeat that our king was the first who bore the title.

‡ Cf. the text quoted in Clinton's *Fasti*, III. 382, note.

hear of no great wars, and though strong and respected, the king of Egypt becomes pacific, political, perhaps even lethargic, up to his death.

What became of the great victorious army he brought home from Asia? Many of them must have been disbanded with honours and rewards. Are these, then, the men called ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΓΟΝΗC, and was this the time and the motive of a fresh settlement of veterans in the Fayyum? I confess I am considerably tempted to adopt this explanation.\* If so a new burden must have been put on the necks of the Egyptian peasants, and whatever remained to them of land in the Fayyum must have been saddled with a race of upstart landlords, for whom the previous owner or tiller under the crown now worked as a labourer. Such contempt of the rights of the natives had been the declared policy of the previous king: he had done all in his power to Hellenize the country out and out. But the reaction was coming; the passive persistence of the Egyptian Fellah was insuperable, and there are symptoms all through Euergetes' later days of a tendency to conciliate national feelings by erecting temples, and honouring native cults. If he did make these concessions, we can well explain the results which followed. No sooner did the government allow that the natives had rights which had long been disregarded, than the discontent at the violence long tolerated would assume a voice, and would be strengthened by the voice of the priests reminding the people of their violated rights. According as the king grew old, and his government careless, these doctrines would be preached without repression, and gather force in the native mind. With the death of the king, and the advent to power of a profligate weakling, Ptolemy Philopator, the agitation of the natives would increase, and all but burst

\* If so, any undated will, in which we find this description of a testator or witness, should necessarily be of the third Ptolemy's time. Unfortunately not a single such fragment, however it may have features of greater antiquity, actually bears a date of the second Ptolemy, except it be that headed *year 26* (XI.), and here there is a lacuna after a witness's name in which ἐπιγόνης would fit very naturally (line 12). But in this will the witnessing *cleruchs* are all so exceptionally young, that it *must* date from the second Ptolemy.

I think I can read, in an unsatisfactory fragment (XIII. 2, l. 8) the words τῶν ἐπιγόνων in the description of a witness. This new title again occurs in a list of witnesses (marked as O, 4, iv., among the Petrie papyri) now in my possession. I refer the reader to my Commentary on XIII. for further details.

into a rebellion. But when a threat of invasion from Syria set the young king's advisers to the task of reconstructing, quickly, an army which had been allowed to fall into idleness and decay—Polybius distinctly implies that the standing army was quite unfit to take the field—they were obliged to call out the veterans settled in the country,\* and, what was far more dangerous, arm the discontented natives, and train them to fight in phalanx. No sooner had these latter finished their victorious campaign at Raphia, than the insurrection seems to have broken out. We have no details of what happened, save that the revolt was long and obstinate, overcome with difficulty, and renewed again upon the accession of the next king. And from this time onward Hellenism began to wane among the Egyptians, and the reconquest of the land by the old race set in.

Even if we count the few documents dated *year 26* as belonging to the third Ptolemy, the Petrie papyri from Gurob, so far as Mr. Sayce and I have examined them, show a sudden termination before or at the end of this reign. There are numerous documents dating from his later years. We have not a single date of the fourth Ptolemy.† It seems very difficult, if not impossible, to attribute this sudden limitation to mere chance. We can infer from the renaming of the *nome* that the settlement was not founded till after Ptolemy II. married his second wife, (the second) Arsinoe. The dates begin, therefore, as we should expect, about the 20th year of his reign. They extend through its later years to the close of the next reign (about 269–225 B.C.). There they seem suddenly to stop. Shall we say that the disturbances which supervened in Egypt began with the outlying Fayyum, that in any case when the knights were called out by the new king, they returned to find themselves dispossessed, and unable to reconquer their lands in the general confusion of the national insurrection? I

\* Esp. *ιππέας τῶν κατοίκων* (Polybius). These *κάτοικοι* are either never alluded to in the present documents, or they are identical with the *cleruchs* we have before us. To this point I shall return.

† I have since found, in a mummy-case sent to me by Mr. Petrie, the year *εη* (18) of Ptolemy, son of the Gods *Philopatres* mentioned. This title means Epiphanes, the fifth Ptolemy, who is the king of the Rosetta stone, and the date 186 B.C. But Mr. Petrie informs me that this case came from the Hawara Necropolis. Mr. Sayce has found one text in which *φιλομητρούς* (*σις*) occurs, but the context is lost, and we cannot use the single word as an argument of any weight.

[4\*]

think this a reasonable solution of the facts before us, but we cannot lay it down as history till the whole matter has been sifted by further inquiry. Documents found at Hawara, of which a few are in my possession, show at first sight by their handwriting that here a Greek society lived at a later date, but rather Roman and Christian, than late Ptolemaic. In any case Hawara was close to the Nile, whereas Gurob was remote, and therefore more difficult to protect from the native insurgents.

#### THE TEXTS.

§ 14. **The Antiope of Euripides.** —The readers of Euripides' fragments have long recognized the *Antiope* as one of his most celebrated plays. It is quoted by Plato (*Gorgias*, pp. 485 *sqq.*), as containing, in the dialogues between Amphion and Zethus, the heroine's exposed and long-lost children, the speculations of the poet on the superiority of *music* to field sports or athletics. Amphion, who had received his lyre as a gift from Hermes, and was devoted to music, is reproved and ridiculed by the ruder and more energetic Zethus for his idle dalliance,\* and it is not till the end of the play, which we have now recovered, that we find the decision of the gods in favour of Amphion, who builds the walls of Thebes with his lyre, and becomes king of the country. But in addition to this philosophical episode in the tragedy, there was the exciting passage of the appearance of the captive Antiope, who had fled from her oppressors, and who claimed protection from the young men whom she claimed as her children. It appears that the ruder Zethus rejected her prayers, and that she was about to be tied (by Dirce's orders) to the horns of a wild bull, when Amphion's gentleness and consequent hesitation gave time for the old peasant who had brought them up as his own in the mountain (Cithæron) to disclose his secret, and so turned the punishment designed for Antiope upon her persecutor, Dirce. The moment when the latter was tied to the bull is perpetuated in the famous marble group at Naples, the work of Apollonius and

\* Cf. the quotations in Nauck's *Fragg. Trag. Græc.*, pp. 414 *sqq.* (2nd Ed.).

Tauriscus, the sculptors of Tralles.\* Her hideous death was then narrated by an eye-witness, from whose speech Longinus has quoted a sentence as an example of majestic conciseness.†

All these events in the play had passed before we come to the last act, in which the young men entice Lycus, the husband of Dirce, and king of the land, into the mountain, where they lay an ambush for him, seize him, and are on the point of putting him to death, when the god Hermes appears (*ex machina*), arrests the action of the young men, and orders Lycus to bury the remains of his wife in the fountain thence called Dirce, and to resign his kingdom to Amphion, whose building of Thebes and marriage to Niobe, the daughter of Tantalus, are also prophesied. With the acquiescence of Lycus, the action of the play seems to have concluded.

It is from this last act that portions of three pages have turned up among accounts and registers dating from the years 3 and 11 of Ptolemy III., roughly speaking, 245–35 b.c. They had all been used indiscriminately to make up the carton-casing which enclosed a mummy. Fragment A (I.) is a dialogue between the agitated Antiope and one of her sons, in which the latter endeavours to allay her fears, shows that the murder of Dirce has made all reconciliation impossible, and that they must either overcome the tyrant or die. At the effaced close of this fragment Lycus himself is announced, and evidently makes a speech explaining the cause of his unexpected appearance. The next thing was to entice him away from his friends, and bring him into some rustic shed, where the young men could seize and bind him. This appears to be the subject of Fragment B (I.), which is unfortunately so broken that we can only guess at the sense. Either the old peasant or one of the young men known as his sons is urging Lycus to come away with him, and hide in the hut, which is really to be the scene of his capture. The alleged object was to capture Antiope, who had escaped from his control. A chorus of Boeotian peasants was the spectator of these events, and the largest Fragment C (II.)

\* Cf. my *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 337 *sqq.*

† εἰ δέ πον  
τύχοι, πέριξ ἐλίξας εἶλχ' ὅμοῦ λαβόν  
γυναικα, πέτραν, δρῦν, μεταλλάσσων ἀεί.

opens with the close of their excited choral song, in which they anticipate the tyrant's fall. From this chorus we have a quotation in Stobæus, which differs considerably from the reading of our text. Then follows the dialogue on the reappearance of Lycus in bonds, and then the speech of the god, followed by the submission of Lycus. A few lines from the chorus may (as is usual with Euripides) have concluded the tragedy.

§ 15. **The Fragments Described.**—Such is the import of the fragments reproduced on Autotypes I. and II. They are, without doubt, far the oldest specimens of any classical text the modern world has yet seen. I have printed in the following Plates the other scraps from classical poets which I have found in the collection. The reader will at once see that while these latter are in the ordinary Ptolemaic hand—I mean ordinary in the third century B.C.—the *Antiope* has quite a different appearance. The hand is very neat and small, as was suitable for bringing the text of a whole play within moderate compass. Had the present fragments been written as large as the extracts on the following Autotypes, we should have found very little indeed upon the amount of papyrus we have recovered, whereas the double columns of 36 lines are almost as compressed as modern print. There is a broad margin, and hardly a sign of succeeding parallel columns, which are visible in all the other papyri. The Plato fragments, for example, were not only written in a long series of parallel columns, but were plainly rolled up in the ordinary way, as may be seen from the direction of the fractures in the papyrus. The pages of the *Antiope* might almost seem to have been like modern pages, forming a little quarto volume, with only one side of the papyrus employed. But this last fact, as Weil has observed, makes the roll form much more likely. Tablets of wax, on which ancient authors composed, must have been of the book shape; that they were imitated in papyrus is cited by H. Diels, in reviewing my first publication of the fragments in *Hermathena*, as a proof that a book was written by a private hand, and not for sale. But he had not before him the actual handwriting.\*

\* There is possibly one letter of an adjoining column to the right of lines A 19 and of C 15. But I cannot assert this positively.

On the whole, the hand reminds one strongly of a lapidary hand transferred to slighter material. Here is the form of the writer's alphabet, and under it that of the *Phædo* papyrus, which the reader may verify on the fac-similes. I have omitted in the second series letters which agree perfectly with those of the first, but I will add that the Π often has a short right leg, and that the Ν occurs with the middle bar almost horizontal, and the right bar elevated above the line :—

ΑΒΓΔΕΙΗΘΙΚΛΜΝΞ·ΠΡΩΤΥΦΧΨω  
Α βγδεεεηθικλμνοπτω φχψω

It will at once be observed, that these two alphabets hardly differ, the ΑΔΛΧ of the *Antiope* being a little more obtuse (divaricated) in the vertical angle, while the Ε of the *Phædo* often preserves the old lapidary square shape. The *Phædo* is merely more carefully written, with the characters more even, more upright, and more separated. No material difference of age can be inferred between them, but, as compared with the mass of the other handwritings here reproduced, any palæographer would pronounce them to be much older. My recent labours among these mummy-cases have, however, disclosed some fragments sufficiently near in character to those of the *Phædo* to make this inference doubtful.\* We may, moreover, be misled by the greater care with which classical books were written at Alexandria by skilled and trained scribes. For I have since found a few scraps (cf. IV. 2), in every case from some classical author, which show that literary works were copied by professional writers with such elegance, that they differed from everyday writing as much as our printing does. In fact, after some experience, it is easy to tell at a glance whether fragments of this age are private letters, legal documents, or literary works.

As regards the competence and carefulness of the scribe of the *Antiope*, we may say that on the whole his copy is good, nor can we with certainty

\* Such a fragment is given on the extreme right of the little group of unrecognized scraps at the top of VII. The rest of this group probably belong to the *Phædo*. But this is on paler papyrus, and in slightly larger and slightly different writing.

set down, in the legible portions of the text, any blunders save the following\* :—He writes ΤΑΝΤΑΛΛΟΥ, violating the metre, ΨΕΙΔΕΙC for ΨΕΥΔΕΙC, ΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΥΜΕΝΗ for ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΥΜΕΝΗ, if we have read him correctly ; he elides, and does not elide, indiscriminately, as if it were to him of no consequence at all.† In some of the places where traces of letters still remain, and we have yet been unable to divine the word, it may possibly be owing to some freak in the writer. But I have so often found myself wrong in adopting this hypothesis, that I believe all the difficulties arise from the erasure of the ink, and from my own want of insight in not restoring it by conjecture. And here conjectures are indeed invaluable, seeing that we have considerable means left for verifying them, by fitting them to the size of the lacuna, or to the remaining traces of letters which are unintelligible till they are expounded by the true assumption.

The present edition of this important text differs in some respects from my former edition (in *Hermathena*, xvii.). There I merely tried to reproduce, as well as might be, the original, and added no suggestions which would alter that text. I supplied, indeed, from the conjectures of my colleagues and from my own, such words or letters as might fill gaps, but did not trouble the reader with a number of obvious emendations, which had already occurred to most of us here, but which demanded serious alterations in the text of the papyrus. Now, on the contrary, that the greatest scholars in Europe have proffered their advice, I give in critical notes what they and we have since made out, all the while adhering to the very letters of the original in my transcription.

M. H. Weil's views, in addition to the few things which he had already sent me, are published in the *Revue des Études grecques* for March, 1891; the rest I have received privately and independently from the scholars to whom I here return my sincere thanks. In the *Classical Review* for March, 1891,

\* εμειχθη, like τεισται, is the older, and, perhaps, more correct form used in lapidary Greek for εμιχθη, τισται. The exclamation ωι (for ω) has also old authority in inscriptions. αοτεως was misprinted in my earlier publication.

† I will only suggest that when the habit was universal of writing all the words continuously without any break, elision may have been neglected in order to facilitate the reader's apprehension of the separate words. Thus ταδειναιαμα is less ambiguous than ταδειναιαμα.

both Mr. W. G. Rutherford and Professor Campbell have printed restorations of the text. A few more words, especially in the left column of C, have also been deciphered in the meanwhile by further study, and some mistakes corrected.

§ 16. I have placed next (III.) a few short pieces of poetry, which I gather from the actual statement on the first, and from the size of the handwriting in this and the rest, to have been no complete poems, but rather elegant extracts, for the use of educators, or of their pupils.

Under these there are fragments of the *Iliad* which I failed to identify, because there are several terminations and beginnings of lines not to be found in any known MS. of Homer. But Mr. Bury has established that in the longer passage we have *Iliad* Α, 503–37. The important variations in the text (which, unfortunately, is so mutilated that we can only establish this fact), show that we have here the edition neither of Zenodotus nor of Aristarchus. That it could not be the latter we must infer from the date of the accompanying papers, which are all nearly a century earlier than Aristarchus' time (160–30 B.C.). There is, therefore, no accident more deplorable than that which has robbed us of the rest of this fragment. Its handwriting (like that of IX.) differs considerably in character from the accompanying documents, and would never have been suspected of such great antiquity but for the surroundings in which it was found. The accompanying scrap in Epic style appears, according to Mr. Bury's acute and learned conjecture, to be from the 'Hōai, and not from Homer.

The next Autotype (IV.) gives a passage in 'comic iambics.' I have added, from the scraps recently examined by myself, a fragment of a tragedy defaced beyond recognition, on account of the remarkable handwriting—perhaps the clearest of the whole collection. The occurrence of the word **CHMANTOPEC**, which does not appear\* in our extant plays, makes it certain that it is from a lost play.

The Gurob papyri have indeed shown one indisputable fact to the palæographer. There was such an apparent variety of writing in use, even in documents dated the same year, that all inferences from types of writing must be based on a minute study of individual letters.

\* A v. l. in *Ed. Res.* 957, σημάντωρ γενοῦ.

§ 17. The Platonic fragments, which occupy the four following Plates (V.–VIII.), are the remains of a very carefully and beautifully written roll, containing the *Phædo*. Among all the classical MSS. found in Egypt, and dating long before the mediæval parchments on which our printed texts have been based, these fragments will now occupy the first place. So antique is their appearance, that Mr. Sayce and I were at one time inclined to attribute them to an Attic scribe, whose volume was imported into the Fayyum by some old soldier of literary tastes, who came from Hellas. The occurrence of the forms ΟΥΘΕΝ and of ΑΙΔΕC will make some critics attribute the copy to early Alexandrian days; but the evidence of dated inscriptions shows that such forms were really classical. The differences between the readings of this MS. and those of our best mediæval texts, though they do not affect the argument, are such in regard to style, that they clearly indicate a tradition distinct from that afterwards current. It has been of late years suspected\* by scholars that the Alexandrian critics edited the older texts from a rhetorical standpoint, and introduced refinements which they considered indispensable to good prose. Among these one of the most important was that law forbidding the hiatus between the final and initial vowels of two succeeding words, concerning which Benseler's tract has been too often quoted as conclusive.† The fragments before us show in several places a complete disregard for this law, where our mediæval texts avoid its violation by a mere variation in the order of the words. As a change from the observance to the non-observance of such a law cannot be rationally explained, while the reverse proceeding is exactly what we have reason to expect, it follows that the MS. before us represents the pre-Alexandrine tradition, or, at least, the condition of Plato's text before it had been "improved" by the early grammarians to an extent unsuspected by most modern scholars. Mr. Gunion Rutherford stands alone in England in having suspected and asserted such things about the text of Thucydides; his theory, which was received with much alarm by our schoolmasters, derives a general corroboration from the

\* e.g. by Gomperz in his remarkable article on a possible tract of Protagoras lying unobserved among the Hippocratic writings, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, vol. cxx. (1890).

† *De hiatu in Oratoribus Atticis et historicis Græcis* (1841).

phenomena disclosed in the present fragments. These have been critically annotated by my colleague, Mr. W. J. M. Starkie, and I must refer to the commentary we have added for the details which support what I have now stated. How such a precious\* MS. should have been degraded to the condition of waste paper can only be explained either by its having gone to pieces from long use, and so become despised, or from some such catastrophe as that which I have suggested in my remarks on the opening of the fourth Ptolemy's reign.

§ 18. **The Wills.**—I know not that any part of this Report will excite more interest among antiquarians than the discovery of the sheets of a Probate Court at Arsinoe—for so I may entitle the series of testaments, drawn up in parallel columns, with the end of one and the beginning of another often found on the same column. These cannot be the original autographs, but must be legal duplicates, kept in a public office for the purpose of verification, perhaps, also, of taxation. The fact, that in many of them the reigning king and queen, and their descendants, are appointed executors, would, in itself, make it necessary to have an official copy in the public archives. These papyri had been, I think, deliberately pulled in pieces, when they were condemned to be waste paper; for though the recurrence of fixed formulæ makes it easy to fit together separated fragments, yet some twenty pieces, making three or four groups, identical in the quality of the papyrus, the handwriting and the date, are each and all isolated texts, thus showing how numerous were the wills in the series. I have succeeded beyond my expectation in XIX., where seven or eight pieces have been united, so as to give the conclusion of one will, and the whole of the next, all but complete. We can here trace a variation in the handwriting, even on the same page, and, we may presume, in the same writer. The second document is in a much larger and finer hand than the first. But by comparing other wills, dated the same year, we find far greater differences, and an extraordinary variety in handwriting. Thus, from a palæographical point of view, these dated documents are of

\* In spite of the careful writing there are patent blunders in this text also, perhaps as many as in the *Antiope*.

[5\*]

capital importance. It is, moreover, inconceivable that such official copies, by various hands, should ever have been recorded except at the very time when the testament was drawn up and witnessed. From the headings here and there to be seen, the records seem to have been monthly. I have only been able to reproduce a portion of these documents, but have chosen from them the most complete and the most contrasted. A number of lesser fragments in my hands give corroboration to my readings, and sometimes supply words wanting in the more complete copies. Only three of all the mummy-cases we examined produced these documents, and produced them in groups close together, so that a lucky accident has here saved for us a distinct class of texts nowhere else represented.

§ 19. **Their Formulae.**—The first and most elaborate of the formulae with which these wills open is—

(1) The date; and as certainty is here vital to this Memoir, I have explained the system in full detail above (§ 12). Our fragments follow accurately the official wording of the Canopus inscription, and we have certainly wills of the 10th, the 12th, and the 22nd year of the third Ptolemy before us (237, 235, 225 B.C.). There are others mentioning other years, but unfortunately the name of the king is lost, so that we cannot tell whether they date from the second or the third Ptolemy. But in no case do the formulae of the fourth (Philopator) or fifth (Epiphanes) or any later sovereign appear. The dating of the Rosetta stone, as well as of many of the later papyri preserved at Turin, Leyden, &c., show us that the titles of each new king and queen were added to the list of deities whose worship was conducted by the “priest of Alexander.” Moreover, an *Athlophorus* of Berenice was created beside the *Canephorus* of Arsinoe, and presently other dignitaries of the same rank and privileges. The dates before us, in which none of these names appear, are therefore unmistakable, and in no case have we even the compendious forms which came into use when the list of priests and the gods they represented became cumbrous.

After the date which gives (a) the year of the reigning king, (b) the names of the priests of Alexander, &c., and of the Canephorus of Arsinoe Philadelphus, (c) the day of the month, (d) the locality, there follows—

(2) The preamble and description of the testator, in this form: “Being of sound mind and good understanding, A, son of B, made the following bequest,” and then he is described as so many years old, from such a country, either tall, short, fat, or lean, with straight or curly hair, with his moles and his scars, the latter being a prominent feature among the Greek settlers of the Fayyum. For these veterans also name their old regiment, mentioning (I suppose with special pride) the guards or the cavalry.

(3) The opening words of the actual will are also a formula, though admitting of some variations, which show that no mere office clerk drew them up. “May it be my lot to keep in health and manage my own affairs, but if I should suffer anything human, I bequeath . . .”.

(4) The details of the bequest. In the cases where these are lengthy, they are all so torn and mutilated as to be only partly intelligible; but where a single heir inherits everything—a not uncommon case—it is the wife, the son, the daughter; in one instance a Thracian young woman not more closely described. Nor is the bequest to the wife or daughter coupled (so far as our fragments disclose) with the name of any trustee or *kúpios*. In the wills made under the third Ptolemy, there usually follows—

(5) The appointment of the king and queen, and their descendants, as executors, which, I suppose, means no more than that the State administrated the testator’s dispositions. There is no instance of the appointment of the second Ptolemy; whether because none of the wills date from his day, or because the practice arose from some new legislation under his son, I cannot tell.

The documents conclude with—

(6) The enumeration of the witnesses, each described as to age, prominence, military rank, and personal appearance. A comparison of many such lists led me to conclude that six was the normal number: though this, too, seems to have been variable;\* and I since found in Leemans’ papyri that

\* The document on XIX. exhibits only four, but was doubtless continued on the next column. This scribe, as appears from other fragments, was most particular in having a broad margin, and continues his text on the ensuing column without any break or paragraph. One other fragment has seven.

a contract of six witnesses (*συγγραφὴ ἐξ μαρτύρων*) was a technical term to distinguish certain deeds from those of sale, which required sixteen.

There is no concluding formula whatever.

Such is the description of a will among the Greek mercenaries of the Fayyum; and, as they came from all parts of the Hellenic world, we may fairly suppose that it represents what was in use elsewhere at an earlier period.

§ 20. On this point we had hitherto but scanty information. Let the reader refer to the new edition of Smith's *Antiquities*, or even to the far more complete new edition of C. F. Hermann's *Alterthümer*, and he will see how vague and slight are the statements, how few the references, on this important subject.

I shall here record what they say, but add new matter derived from a special search for evidence. The usual formula they quote for the opening words of a will is that found in Diogenes Laertius, when giving the testaments of various philosophers: *e. g.* that of Aristotle (v. § 11), *ἔσται μὲν εὖ, ἔὰν δέ τι συμβαίνῃ*, which is far less explicit than the preambles of the papyri. That the formulæ of these latter, however, were known appears both from an expression in the will of Epicurus, given by the same collector (x. § 21): *ἔὰν δέ τι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων περὶ Ἐρμαχον γυνῆται, &c.*, and from the words of the orator Isaeus (*de Ap. Hered.* § 1), *διέθετο, εἰ τι πάθοι*. We can also infer from Isaeus that, in official copies, the preliminary formula found its place. He argues (*de Philoct. Hered.* § 9) that as the law requires the testator not to be *παρανόων*, the acts of Philoctemon amply show that he was *εὐ φρονῶν*, thus implying the very words of our formula—*νοῶν καὶ φρονῶν*.\* He shows furthermore (*de Cleon. Hered.* § 14), in the case of a testator revoking a will, that it had not been deposited with a friend or relation, but in the archives of a court, from which the magistrate must bring it. This is precisely what we might infer from the wills now before us. And as regards the number of the witnesses, who might or might not know the contents of the will, he says that it is usual to have as many as possible, showing that the number was not fixed

\* *Ζῶν καὶ φρονῶν* frequently occurs in dedications of memorials, *e. g.* Bœckh, CIG, Index, *sub. o.c.*

(*de Astyph. Hered.* § 13). Lastly, we hear from him that there were solemn imprecations (*ἀρπάι*) at the close; these are foreign to the veterans of the Fayyum.

All these passages afford a general corroboration that we have, in the Fayyum papyri, an old and general type of Greek testament. Isaeus adds that no one bequeaths to his sons, who are the heirs by law of his property; and possibly this may be the case as regards the real property of the Egyptian Greeks; for I only find the land, the *κλῆρος*, mentioned in one fragment, unfortunately with the context so mutilated that we cannot tell more about it. But the Greek practice did not prevail generally in the Fayyum, for we have frequent bequests of personal property, at all events, to a son mentioned as sole heir.

Fortunately, however, there is one instance long extant which gives us the whole formula of the Egyptian wills explicitly. An inscription which has been known ever since 1750, when it was published in the *Museo* of Maffei, and which now figures as No. 2448 in Boeckh's *Corpus*, is not quoted in the handbooks, though it is the capital document on the subject. It is known as the Testament of Epicteta, and is recited in the preamble of a decree based upon it, as her bequests are for the benefit of the public (probably) of Thera. The date is about the third century B.C., that is to say, about the age of our papyri. Its formulæ are strictly upon the same pattern.

*Date.*—ΕΠΙ ΕΦΟΡΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΝ φοΙΒΟΤΕΛΕΙ

*Prelim. Formula and Name.*—ΤΑΔΕ ΔΙΕΘΕΤΟ ΝοοΥCA ΚΑΙ φΡoΝoΥCA  
ΕΠΙΚΤΑΤΑ ΓΡΙΝΝΟΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΠΕΙΔΙYC ΤoY ΘΡΑCYΛΕoNToC,  
ΣΥΝΕΥAPECToYCAC KAI TAC ΘΥΓΑΤRoC ΕΠΙΤΕΛΕΙAC TAC φoΙNIKoC.

*Opening Formula.*—ΕΙΗ ΜEN MoI ΥΓΙAΙNoΥCAI KAI CωIοMENAI  
TA ΙΔIA ΔΙOΙKEΝ, EI ΔE TI KA ΓΕΝHTAI ΠΕΡΙ ME ΤWN ΑΝΘΡωPΙNWN,  
ΑΠoΛEΙPω, &c.

Here, then, is the very same type in the island of Thera, and we may infer from the evidence I have collected that it was general throughout the Greek world since the fourth century B.C.

These materials will lead the jurists to reconsider the position they have maintained, that the full and free right of bequeathing was not admitted or practised till its development by Roman lawyers and in Roman society.

Maine, for example,\* while acknowledging that the Athenian will, as implied in the legal cases of Isaeus, is of indigenous growth, calls it only an *inchoate testament* on account of the restrictions it implied. No Athenian was allowed to disinherit his son, who succeeded by law in spite of any adverse testament. Hence it was not the practice at Athens to make mention of such necessary heirs in any testament. Some such limitation seems also implied in the document above quoted—the will of Epicteta—from the island of Thera, for she bequeaths property to public uses, *with the consent of her natural heirs*. Professor Graham has pointed out to me that the two features to be noted in a perfectly developed system of free testation are—(1) the absence of any limitations by the clan or by the State, and (2) the absence of elaborate forms and ceremonies accompanying the act. In fact the nearer the document approaches to an ordinary legal contract the more developed we must regard it.

From both these points of view the wills now produced, fragmentary as they are, point to a development as complete as that of the Roman will. It is true, as Professor Graham has also pointed out to me, that soldiers are likely to have had special privileges, and that therefore we must not infer with certainty from this class the general condition of the society around them. But although the society of the Arsinoite nome was a settlement of soldiers, this settlement turned them into *bona fide* citizens; nor does it appear that all the members of it, nay, even of those whose wills we have recovered, were non-civilians. Thus the very complete will of Aphrodisias (XIX.) merely describes him as a *sojourner*, without giving any military rank or description, nor can his scars be regarded as evidence by themselves. The appointment of the Crown as executor does not seem to have been compulsory, even with soldiers; and upon the most careful review of the documents, I cannot find any traces of special privileges for this special class, as we know there existed in the case of Roman soldiers' wills.

If we turn back to the first point above stated, the existence of State limitations upon private rights of bequeathing, these Arsinoite wills seem to imply none whatever. We can, indeed, only use the argument from silence

\* *Ancient Law*, pp. 194–196.